

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

The Office action mailed on April 4, 2006 has been carefully reviewed and the above identified amendments have been provided to thoroughly address each of the objections and rejections provided by the examiner in that Office action. In addition, the following remarks are submitted to clarify and explain the importance of the above amendments and to support a finding by the examiner that the claims, as amended, are now in a form warranting allowance of this case. Accordingly, the undersigned respectfully requests reconsideration by the examiner in this case.

At the outset, applicant notes from page 11 of the above-identified Office action (numbered paragraph 15) that claims 23-28 were only objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim. The examiner indicated that these claims would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Applicant has amended claim 23 to include the requirements of claims 1, 21 and 22 from which claim 23 had previously depended. Claim 23 has also been placed in independent form. Accordingly, claim 23 should now be in a form warranting allowable status. Claims 24-28 have been left unamended. These claims depend from amended claim 23 and should thus now also be in a form warranting allowable status.

The examiner had rejected each of the remaining claims under 35 U.S.C. §102 and §103. In addition, claims 5, 12 and 53 had been rejected under §112, second paragraph. While applicant does not fully agree with the examiner's basis for rejecting these claims, applicant has chosen to amend these claims to include requirements akin to those found in claim 23 (indicated above as containing allowable subject matter). With regard to the rejection under §112, applicant respectfully submits that claims 5, 12 and 53 are properly supported by the specification as described in detail below.

Specifically, and with reference to the claims in numerical order, the claims have been amended as follows. Claim 1 has been amended to include the requirements of

claim 21 and substantially all of original claim 23. In essence, amended claim 21 is similar to amended claim 23 except that it does not include limitations in claims 22 and 23 that limit the particular printer claimed to being a "screen printer." In studying the examiner's statement of reasons for indication of allowable subject matter, while the examiner uses the term "screen" the examiner does not appear to have focused on the nature of the printer as a reason for allowance of claim 23. Rather, other limitations relating to the alignment locations on the bed and the printing spaces on the printer, as well as their correlation to each other appear to provide the basis for finding allowable subject matter. These limitations remain in amended claim 1, such that amended claim 1 should be in a form warranting allowable subject matter.

Claims 2-20 depend from amended claim 1, either directly or through intervening claims. Accordingly, these claims benefit from the amendments made to claim 1 and should now also be in a form warranting allowable status.

Claim 21 has been canceled in that its limitations have been added to amended claim 1. Claim 22 has been amended to depend directly from amended claim 1. Accordingly, claim 22 should now also be in a form warranting allowable status.

Claims 29-31 depend from amended claim 1, either directly or through intervening claims. Accordingly, these claims benefit from the amendments made to claim 1 and should now also be in a form warranting allowable status.

Claim 32 has been amended to include requirements similar to those found in original claims 21 and 23. Applicant has slightly modified some of these new limitations from the way that they were added to amended claim 1. However, the essential features of the alignment locations of the bed and the print spaces of the printer remain; consistent with the examiner's statement of reasons for allowance. Accordingly, amended claim 32 should now be in a form warranting allowable status.

Claims 33-54 depend from amended claim 32, either directly or through intervening claims. Accordingly, these claims benefit from the amendments made to

claim 32 and should now also be in a form warranting allowable status.

New claims 71-79 have been provided for the examiner's kind consideration. These new claims are similar in content to canceled claims 61-70 which had been required to be canceled in the previous *Ex parte Quayle* action that has now been vacated. While these new claims are method claims, they include limitations that track very closely to the limitations of non-method claims 1 and 32, such that applicant respectfully submits that they are directed to sufficiently similar subject matter to warrant their examination along with claims 1-54 in this case.

In particular, new claim 71 represents a combination of previous claim 61 with most of the requirements of previously presented claim 66 (which was similar in content to claim 21) and the requirements of original claim 23, with some modifications. New claim 71 thus includes limitations similar to those found in amended claims 1 and 32. Accordingly, new claim 71 should also be in a form warranting allowable status. New claims 72-79 depend from new claim 71 and thus benefit from the requirements contained in claim 71 and should now also warrant allowable status. Claims 72-79 represent the subject matter of previously presented claims 62-70, with the elimination of claim 66 as it is made redundant by the inclusion of its limitations within claim 71.

With regard to the rejection under §112, the examiner had indicated that review of the specification had not identified any "moving means." Applicant directs the examiner to the following disclosure. Figures 19 and 20 show a first embodiment of moving means which utilizes a shuffler blade 52, a damper blade 54 and a spatula 56. These structures are described at pages 21-23 as being used to move the substrate blocks. While initially these structures are described as part of a shuffling machine 50, such "shuffling" is one form of "moving." For instance, at page 22, lines 17 and 18 the written description states "the above described shuffling machine 50 provides one form of a means for moving the substrate blocks 20. Other moving means are described below." The text then goes on to describe a variety of different moving methods and

associated moving means. Applicant respectfully submits that the limitations in claims 5, 12 and 53 relating to "means for moving" are thus adequately supported by the specification to satisfy the requirements of §112.

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully requested that the examiner pass this case to issue. If, upon consideration, the examiner believes further issues remain outstanding or new ones have been generated, the undersigned requests that the examiner call the undersigned to set up a personal or telephone interview with the undersigned to resolve any such remaining issues.

Respectfully Submitted:



Bradley P. Heisler
Applicant's Attorney
Telephone (916) 781-6634
Registration No.: 35,892

10-4-06

Date